

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-50 in the application. The Examiner has indicated that Claims 1-5 and 11-50 have been allowed and that Claims 9-10 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. The Applicant believes the other pending Claims are also allowable and has not amended, canceled or added any claims. Accordingly, Claims 1-50 are currently pending in the application.

### **I. Formal Matters and Objections**

The Examiner has objected to the specification for lacking the proper identification of related applications. Specifically, the Examiner has noted that the original specification does not include the serial numbers of the related applications. In response, the Applicant has amended the specification to include the serial numbers for each related application.

### **II. Rejection of Claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,732,107 to Phillips, *et al.* (Phillips). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Phillips is directed to interpolation of samples and, more particularly, to the use of FIR interpolation combined with Spline interpolation. (*See* column 1, lines 25-27.) Phillips provides a FIR interpolator that uses a zero order hold technique to interpolate samples of an input stream. (*See* column 4, lines 20-28.) Phillips does not teach, however, a method of interpolating a one-bit input signal that includes generating a sample range from at least three input samples associated with the one-bit input signal as recited in independent Claim 6. In fact, the Applicant does not find where

Phillips even addresses interpolating a one-bit input signal. More specifically, the Applicant does not find where Phillips teaches the input stream is one bit or any of the samples of the input stream, for example, S0, are one bit. Instead, Phillips suggests that the samples of the input stream are greater than one bit due to the complexity of the filters used in the FIR interpolators. (*See* Figure 3 and columns 5, line 28 to column 7, line 67.)

Therefore, Phillips does not disclose each and every element of independent Claim 6 and as such, is not an anticipating reference thereof. Because Claims 7-8 are dependent upon Claim 6, Phillips also cannot be an anticipating reference for Claims 7-8. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §102 rejection with respect to these claims and issue allowance of Claims 6-8.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant now sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a Notice of Allowance for Claims 6-8 in addition to the other pending Claims 1-5 and 11-50 that have been allowed or are allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, P.C.



J. Joel Justiss  
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: 9/20/04

P.O. Box 832570  
Richardson, Texas 75083  
(972) 480-8800